

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/690,704	Applicant(s) SHTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner DAVID TUROCY	Art Unit 1792	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) DAVID TUROCY.

(3) Stephen Forrest. *SMA*

(2) Aaron Kamlay. *AK*

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 12/22/2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all applied.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant and Applicant representative discussed Shtein references in relation to the inherent difference between OVPD and OVJP, including the use or absence of dynamic pressure. The examiner offered opinions on the arguments and it was agreed that amendments and/or arguments will be presented for consideration on the record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/David Turocy/
Examiner, Art Unit 1792